

reason why one skilled in the relevant art would arrive at the claimed invention when reviewing the references. That is, the rejection does not demonstrate that the concept of utilizing a single mold that bonds the sheets to the core, forms the sidewall, and forms the peripheral bond would be obvious from the references. The rejection, therefore, presents no line of reasoning as to why a person skilled in the relevant art, when reviewing only the collective teachings of the references, would have found it obvious to selectively pick and choose various elements and/or concepts from the references to arrive at the claimed invention. In other words, the rejection does little more than cite Rudy, Goodwin, and Lea to show that one or more elements, when each is viewed in a vacuum, may be known.

The rejection states that Lea discloses it is known to bond the core to the sheets at the same time the peripheral seam is formed. Lea does not, however, teach or suggest the concept of utilizing a mold to form the sidewall during bonding, as recited in independent claim 1. Furthermore, the rejection states that Goodwin discloses it is known to use molds to join two sheets to a resilient core while simultaneously forming a peripheral seam. In fact, Goodwin discloses these actions in two distinct steps. The sheets are bonded to the core in one step, as depicted in Figures 8A-8C, and the periphery seam is formed in another step that utilized a different apparatus, as depicted in Figures 9A-9B.

Based upon the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Rudy, Goodwin, and Lea. Independent claims 17 and 31 also recite a method wherein a single mold bonds the sheets to the core, forms the sidewall, and forms the peripheral bond. Applicants submit, therefore that independent claims 17 and 31 are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, claims 2-16, 18-30, and 32-35 depend from the independent claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejections be withdrawn and that this application now be allowed.

This Amendment is being timely filed by facsimile transmission on September 8, 2003. Should additional fees or an extension of time be deemed necessary for consideration of this Amendment, such fees or extension are hereby requested and the Commissioner is authorized to

charge deposit account number 19-0733 for the payment of the requisite fee. If anything further is desirable to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned representative at (503) 425-6800.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Byron S. Kuzara
Registration No. 51,255

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Telephone: (202) 824-3000

Dated: September 8, 2003

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 09 2003

OFFICIAL